



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,726	02/23/2004	Enrique Travieso	074869-0013	9498
20277 7590 08/15/2008 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				
EXAMINER				
ALBERTALLI, BRIAN LOUIS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,726

Applicant(s)

TRAVIESO ET AL.

Examiner

BRIAN L. ALBERTALLI

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-63 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new ground(s) of rejection were necessitated by Applicant's amendments.
2. Additionally, with regard to the use of official notice in the rejection of claim 57, the applicant has not stated why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art, therefore the well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art (see MPEP 2144.03).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 30-36, 44-53, 56 and 58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (U.S. Patent 6,345,243), in view of Shreve (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0154071).

In regard to claims 30 and 50, Clark discloses a machine implemented method and machine readable medium (column 11, lines 14-17) for managing language translation (Fig. 5), comprising the steps of:

parsing content in a first language into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

generating an identifier associated with each of the translatable components (a unique attribute identifier is generated for each translatable segment, column 15, lines 40-51);

adding the one or more translatable components and associated identifiers to a translation list (the translatable segment and attribute identifier are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-31); and

storing a translated component, produced by translating a corresponding translatable component in the translation list, and an associated identifier for the translated component (corresponding target segments and their attribute identifiers are stored in a list 514, column 15, lines 32-39).

While Clark discloses that the content is collected from a remote file system using "known techniques" (column 13, lines 41-50), Clark does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages.

Shreve discloses scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages (a web spider, synonymous with a web crawler, searches the Internet for documents to include in a corpus, paragraph 92; the corpus being content in a first language that is to be translated, paragraph 44; a web spider necessarily searches by following links to additional pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark to gather content for translation by scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages, because such a tactic enhances the original corpus and improves subsequent modeling, as taught by Shreve (paragraph 92).

In regard to claim 31, Clark discloses each of the translatable components is one of:

- a text segment (e.g. "Delete", column 19, lines 30-35);
- an image file (graphical display element, column 19, lines 55-65);
- a file (column 21, lines 17-19).

In regard to claim 32, Clark discloses the identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments (a hash function is used to generate the unique attribute identifier for each translatable segment, column 20, lines 12-15).

In regard to claim 33, Clark discloses providing the one or more translatable components and identifiers thereof to a human party for translating the one or more translatable components into the second language (the generated lists are presented to a user-translator to generate the corresponding target segments, column 7, lines 39-55).

In regard to claim 34, Clark discloses:

the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (e.g., English source language, column 13, lines 59-64);

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (e.g., French target language, column 13, lines 59-64); and

the second language is different from the first language (English and French are different languages).

In regard to claim 35, Clark discloses the content in the first language includes text that is not displayed as part of the content in the first language and that is subject to translation (legacy source files, representing previous versions of content in the first language, are identified and translated, column 13, line 51 to column 14, line 14 and column 14, line 66 to column 15, line 11).

In regard to claim 36, Clark discloses if the content in the first language is formatted, at least some formatting information contained in the content in the first language is included in at least one translated component to preserve the format of the content in the first language (supporting source segments describing formatting are preserved to display the target language with the same formatting, column 17, lines 16-31).

In regard to claim 44, Clark discloses the content in the first language is web content containing at least one markup tag (markup languages, which inherently include markup tags, column 8, lines 15-20).

In regard to claim 45, Clark discloses a system for managing language translation, comprising:

- a content accessing unit configured to enable access to content in a first language (input-output devices, column 12, lines 15-34);

- an information processing unit configured for:

- parsing the content in the first language into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

- generating an identifier associated with each of the translatable components (a unique attribute identifier is generated for each translatable segment, column 15, lines 40-51);

- adding the one or more translatable components and associated identifiers to a translation list (the translatable segment and attribute identifier are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-31); and

- storage for a translated component, produced by translating a corresponding translatable component in the translation list, and an associated identifier for the translated component (corresponding target segments and their attribute identifiers are stored in a list 514, column 15, lines 32-39).

While Clark discloses that the content is collected from a remote file system using "known techniques" (column 13, lines 41-50), Clark does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages.

Shreve discloses scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages (a web spider, synonymous with a web crawler, searches the Internet for documents to include in a corpus, paragraph 92; the corpus being content in a first language that is to be translated, paragraph 44; a web spider necessarily searches by following links to additional pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark to gather content for translation by scheduling content in a first language for translation by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages, because such a tactic enhances the original corpus and improves subsequent modeling, as taught by Shreve (paragraph 92).

In regard to claim 46, Clark discloses each of the translatable components is one of:

- a text segment (e.g. "Delete", column 19, lines 30-35);
- an image file (graphical display element, column 19, lines 55-65);
- a file (column 21, lines 17-19).

In regard to claim 47, Clark discloses the identifier for a text segment is generated using at least one of a hash code, a checksum, and a mathematical algorithm based on one or more text segments (a hash function is used to generate the unique attribute identifier for each translatable segment, column 20, lines 12-15).

In regard to claim 48, Clark discloses providing the one or more translatable components and identifiers thereof to a human party for translating the one or more translatable components into the second language (the generated lists are presented to a user-translator to generate the corresponding target segments, column 7, lines 39-55).

In regard to claim 49, Clark discloses:

the first language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (e.g., English source language, column 13, lines 59-64);

the second language includes one of English, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, Chinese, Korean, and Arabic (e.g., French target language, column 13, lines 59-64); and

the second language is different from the first language (English and French are different languages).

In regard to claim 51, Clark discloses a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:

obtaining information related to a first content in a first language (the project identifier selects source files to be included, column 13, lines 41-50);

accessing the first content (the files are added to the project, column 13, lines 29-40);

parsing the first content into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

generating one or more translatable components based on a human translation of the one or more translatable components (target files are generated by a human translator, column 11, lines 52-62); and

storing the one or more translated components in association with the one or more translatable components (the translatable segment and target segment are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-39).

While Clark discloses that the content is accessed from a remote file system using "known techniques" (column 13, lines 41-50), Clark does not disclose accessing the first content by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages.

Shreve discloses accessing content by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages (a web spider, synonymous with a web crawler, searches the Internet for documents to include in a corpus, paragraph 92; the corpus being content in a first language that is to be translated, paragraph 44; a web spider necessarily searches by following links to additional pages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark to access the first content by crawling a web site via following links to additional pages, because such a tactic enhances the original corpus and improves subsequent modeling, as taught by Shreve (paragraph 92).

In regard to claim 52, Clark discloses the step of generating an identifier for each of the translatable components, wherein the storing step includes storing an identifier in association with a corresponding translated component (a unique attribute identifier is generated for each translatable segment, column 15, lines 40-51; and the translatable segment and attribute identifier are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-31).

In regard to claim 53, Clark discloses displaying, on a graphical user interface, the one or more translatable components (a conflict is presented to the user-translator, column 31, lines 40-46); and

displaying, on the graphical user interface, one or more files linked from the first content (the conflict word points to two different files, column 31, lines 26-30; both are displayed to the user-translator for selection, column 31, lines 31-33).

In regard to claim 56, Clark discloses:

receiving a specification of the first content (the project identifier selects files to be included in the source project, column 13, lines 29-36);

adding the specification to a request list (project 210 lists the files to be included, column 13, lines 41-44);

arranging the request list based on a pre-determined priority (files are selected based on predetermined criteria, column 13, lines 45-50).

In regard to claim 58, Clark discloses the step of parsing is performed based on one or more markup tags contained in the first content (parsing is based on tags such as those in, e.g., HTML, column 21, lines 10-16)

5. Claims 37-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark, in view of Shreve, and further in view of Cartus (U.S. Patent 6,993,473).

In regard to claim 37, Clark discloses previewing translations (for e.g. translation conflict resolution, column 31, lines 40-46).

Clark and Shreve do not disclose the step of previewing, on a graphical user interface, a rendition of at least one translated component by displaying each of the translated components within formatted content in the first language.

Cartus discloses a method of graphically assisting a translator, comprising the step of previewing, on a graphical user interface, a rendition of at least one translated component by displaying each of the translated components within formatted content in the first language (Fig. 3C, the bolded translated component in English is displayed within the formatted content in Spanish, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark and Shreve to display a preview of the translated component within formatted content in the first language, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 38, Clark and Shreve do not disclose the step of previewing further comprises displaying, on the graphical user interface, at least one of the translatable components.

Cartus discloses the step of previewing further comprises displaying, on the graphical user interface, at least one of the translatable components (Fig. 3C, the translatable component, i.e. the first paragraph of Spanish text, is displayed, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark and Shreve to display at least one of the translatable components, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 39, Clark and Shreve do not disclose highlighting the at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component in a first scheme; and

highlighting the at least one of the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme.

Cartus discloses highlighting the at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component in a first scheme (Fig. 3B, source text which does not yet have a corresponding translated component is highlighted, column 7, lines 37-49); and

highlighting the at least one of the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme (Fig. 3C, the bolded translated component in English is displayed within the formatted content in Spanish, column 7, lines 49-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark and Shreve to highlight the translatable components that did not have a translated component in a first scheme and highlight the translated components in a second scheme different from the first scheme, because this would help the user know where to focus on the display during the translation process, as taught by Clark (column 7, lines 54-55).

In regard to claim 40, Clark and Shreve do not disclose:
facilitating selection of a translated component;
simultaneously displaying, on the graphical user interface, a corresponding translatable component and the selected translated component.

Cartus discloses a method comprising:
facilitating selection of a translated component (Fig. 3C, a user defines a target-text unit, the bolded English component, column 7, lines 51- 58);

simultaneously displaying, on the graphical user interface, a corresponding translatable component and the selected translated component (Fig. 3C, the defined target-text unit, the bolded English component, and corresponding source-text unit, the italicized Spanish component, are displayed simultaneously, column 7, lines 49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark and Shreve to select a translated component and simultaneously display the corresponding translated component, because this would allow the user to ensure the translated components corresponded correctly to the source components.

In regard to claim 41, Clark discloses:

facilitating selection of a translated component previewed (a translation is presented to the user-translator, column 32, lines 61-62);

facilitating editing of a translated component to produce an updated translated component (the user-translator edits the translation, column 32, line 61 to column 33, line 3);

storing the updated translated component with a corresponding identifier for the translated component (the proper records are updated, column 33, lines 4-30).

In regard to claim 42, Clark discloses:

displaying a reference to a file contained in the content in the first language (user-translator 170 selects source legacy with a graphical user interface, column 14, lines 15-19);

facilitating selection of the reference file (the user-translator 170 identifies the legacy files, column 14, lines 15-19); and

accessing the file when the reference is selected (legacy files are then accessed and processed, column 14, line 66 to column 15, line 11).

In regard to claim 43, Clark discloses the step of previewing is performed in a multi-user environment, in which more than one rendition of at least some of the translated components can be previewed at the same time (user-translator 170 is several users who work on different rendition of a document, column 11, lines 53-59).

6. Claims 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark, in view of Shreve, and further in view of Hargrave et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,593).

In regard to claim 54, Clark and Shreve disclose displaying the one or more translatable components on a graphical user interface (a conflict is presented to the user-translator, column 31, lines 40-46).

Clark and Shreve do not disclose facilitating selection of a string of characters from the displayed one or more translatable components;

searching for a text segment that matches the selected string of characters; and

displaying the text segment.

Hargrave et al. disclose a translation assistant tool that allows a user perform:
facilitating selection of a string of characters from the displayed one or more
translatable components (column 13, lines 23-25);

searching for a text segment that matches the selected string of characters (the
entered string is searched for, column 13, lines 41-67); and

displaying the text segment (matches are displayed for the user, column 14, lines
20-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to modify Clark and Shreve to search for a string of characters and display a
text segment matching the string of characters, because this will allow a translator to
view the text segment in a variety of contexts, thereby aiding in translation, as taught by
Hargrave et al. (column 14, lines 17-24).

In regard to claim 55, Clark and Shreve do not disclose the step of searching is
performed by fuzzy match.

Hargrave et al. disclose the step of searching is performed by fuzzy match
(column 14, lines 17-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to modify Clark and Shreve to perform a fuzzy match, because translation
memories are most useful when they are able to locate fuzzy matches, as taught by
Clark (column 2, lines 58-63).

7. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark, in view of Shreve, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Clark discloses the files are stored in a remote file system (column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 34), but Clark and Shreve do not disclose the specification of the content is a Universal Resource Identifier (URL).

AAPA discloses that it is notoriously well known in the art to identify network resources with a URL. URL's are known to be a simple, readable, and easily understood means for identifying a network resource.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark and Shreve to specify the content with a URL, because URL's are known to be a simple, readable, and easily understood means for identifying a network resource.

8. Claims 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark, in view of Flanagan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,993,471).

In regard to claims 59 and 61, Clark discloses a machine implemented method and machine readable medium (column 11, lines 14-17) for managing language translation (Fig. 5), comprising the steps of:

parsing content in a first language into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

generating an identifier associated with each of the translatable components (a unique attribute identifier is generated for each translatable segment, column 15, lines 40-51);

adding the one or more translatable components and associated identifiers to a translation list (the translatable segment and attribute identifier are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-31); and

storing a translated component, produced by translating a corresponding translatable component in the translation list, and an associated identifier for the translated component (corresponding target segments and their attribute identifiers are stored in a list 514, column 15, lines 32-39).

Clark does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site (Fig. 8, a machine translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Clark, because doing so allows web content to be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12).

In regard to claim 60, Clark discloses a system for machine translation, comprising:

- a content accessing unit configured to enable access to content in a first language (input-output devices, column 12, lines 15-34);

- an information processing unit configured for:
 - parsing the content in the first language into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

- generating an identifier associated with each of the translatable components (a unique attribute identifier is generated for each translatable segment, column 15, lines 40-51);

- adding the one or more translatable components and associated identifiers to a translation list (the translatable segment and attribute identifier are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-31); and

- storage for a translated component, produced by translating a corresponding translatable component in the translation list, and an associated identifier for the translated component (corresponding target segments and their attribute identifiers are stored in a list 514, column 15, lines 32-39).

Clark does not disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site.

Flanagan et al. disclose scheduling content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site (Fig. 8, a machine translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Clark, because doing so allows web content to be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12).

In regard to claim 62, Clark discloses a machine implemented method for managing language translation, comprising the steps of:

- obtaining information related to a first content in a first language (the project identifier selects source files to be included, column 13, lines 41-50);

- accessing the first content (the files are added to the project, column 13, lines 29-40);

- parsing the first content into one or more translatable components (a source file is parsed into translatable segments, column 15, lines 24-31);

- generating one or more translatable components based on a human translation of the one or more translatable components (target files are generated by a human translator, column 11, lines 52-62); and

storing the one or more translated components in association with the one or more translatable components (the translatable segment and target segment are stored in a list 512, column 15, lines 26-39).

Clark does not disclose accessing the first content by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site.

Flanagan et al. disclose accessing content in a first language for translation by storing content intercepted from a web server providing the content to a user browsing a web site (Fig. 8, a machine translator 80 intercepts a web page in language X, column 5, lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to intercept content from a web server and provide the content as input to the translation system of Clark, because doing so allows web content to be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12).

In regard to claim 63, Clark does not disclose the content in the first language is intercepted directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provides the content to the user.

Flanagan et al. disclose the content in the first language is intercepted directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provides the content to the user (column 5, lines 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Clark to intercept the content directly from the web server on-the-fly while the web server provided the content to the user, because this would allow the web content to be rapidly translated with a single mouse click, as taught by Flanagan et al. (column 5, lines 8-12).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BRIAN L. ALBERTALLI** whose telephone number is

(571)272-7616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

BLA 8/12/08